arXiv:1704.08238v1 [math.PR] 26 Apr 2017

Gravitational allocation for uniform points on the sphere

Nina Holden
MIT

Yuval Peres
Microsoft Research

Alex Zhai
Stanford University

Abstract

Given a collection $\mathcal{L}$ of n points on a sphere $\mathbf{S}_n^2$ of surface area n, a fair allocation is a partition of the sphere into n parts each of area 1, and each associated with a distinct point of $\mathcal{L}$. We show that if the n points are chosen uniformly at random and the partition is defined by considering the gravitational field defined by the n points, then the expected distance between a point on the sphere and the associated point of $\mathcal{L}$ is $O(\sqrt{\log n})$. We use our result to define a matching between two collections of n independent and uniform points on the sphere, and prove that the expected distance between a pair of matched points is $O(\sqrt{\log n})$, which is optimal by a result of Ajtai, Komlós, and Tusnády.



Figure 1: Gravitational allocation to n uniform and independent points on a sphere with $n = 15$ and $n = 40$. The basin of attraction of each point has equal area.

1 Introduction

Let n be a positive integer, and let $\mathbf{S}_n^2 \subset \mathbf{R}^3$ be the sphere centered at the origin with radius chosen such that with λ_n denoting surface area we have $\lambda_n(\mathbf{S}_n^2) = n$. For any set $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbf{S}_n^2$ consisting of n points, we say that a measurable function $\psi : \mathbf{S}_n^2 \to \mathcal{L} \cup \{\infty\}$ is a *fair allocation* of λ_n to $\mathcal{L}$ if it satisfies the following:

$$\lambda_n(\psi^{-1}(\infty)) = 0, \qquad \lambda_n(\psi^{-1}(z)) = 1, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{L}. \tag{1.1}$$

For $z \in \mathcal{L}$ we call $\psi^{-1}(z)$ the cell allocated to z. In other words, a fair allocation is a way to divide $\mathbf{S}_n^2$ into n cells of measure 1 (up to a set of measure 0), with each cell associated to a distinct point of $\mathcal{L}$.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a random collection of n points on $\mathbf{S}_n^2$ which is invariant in law under rotations of the sphere, i.e. $\phi(\mathcal{L})$ has the same law as $\mathcal{L}$ for any rotation $\phi : \mathbf{S}_n^2 \to \mathbf{S}_n^2$. An *allocation rule* is a measurable map $\mathcal{L} \mapsto \psi_{\mathcal{L}}$ which is defined $\mathbf{P}$-a.s., such that (i) a.s. $\psi_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a fair allocation of λ_n to $\mathcal{L}$, and (ii) the map $\mathcal{L} \mapsto \psi_{\mathcal{L}}$ is rotation-equivariant. The latter property means that $\mathbf{P}$-a.s., for any $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$ and any rotation map ϕ, we have $\psi_{\phi(\mathcal{L})}(\phi(x)) = \phi(\psi_{\mathcal{L}}(x))$.

Gravitational allocation is a particular allocation rule based on treating points in $\mathcal{L}$ as wells of a potential function. The cell allocated to $z \in \mathcal{L}$ is then taken to be the basin of attraction of z with respect to the flow induced by the negative gradient of this potential. When the potential takes a particular form which mimics the gravitational potential of Newtonian mechanics, it is ensured that each cell has area 1 a.s. In this paper we will consider gravitational allocation on the sphere for the case when $\mathcal{L}$ is a set of n points chosen uniformly and independently at random from $\mathbf{S}_n^2$.

Nazarov, Sodin, and Volberg [NSV07] analyze a fair allocation to the zeros of a certain Gaussian entire function g, obtained from the gradient flow determined by the potential $U = \log|g| - \frac{1}{2}|z|^2$. Gravitational allocation was explicitly constructed by Chatterjee, Peled, Peres, and Romik [CPPR10a]. They consider gravitational allocation to the points $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbf{R}^d$ of a unit intensity Poisson point process (PPP) for $d \geq 3$. Both papers [NSV07] and [CPPR10a] prove an exponential tail (with a small correction for the PPP and $d = 3$) for the diameter of the cell containing the origin. Phase transitions for the cells of gravitational allocation to a PPP in $\mathbf{R}^d$ were studied in [CPPR10b].

The gravitational allocation for a PPP in $\mathbf{R}^d$ as studied in [CPPR10a] is not well-defined for $d = 2$ because the sum defining the force is divergent. Indeed, a lower bound for $d \leq 2$ was proved in [HL01, Lig02]: any allocation rule for a PPP in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with $d = 1, 2$ satisfies $\mathbf{E}[X^{d/2}] = \infty$, where X is the average distance between the origin and a point in its basin. Nevertheless, one can study the behavior of gravitational allocation in two dimensions by considering a finite version of the problem, which motivates our present setting of taking finitely many points on the sphere. Our results are consistent with [HL01], because the average distance (after appropriate scaling) will grow as $\sqrt{\log n}$ with the number of points n.

Earlier works have also studied other allocation rules. The stable marriage allocation [HHP06, HHP09] can be defined for every translation-invariant point process with unit intensity in $\mathbf{R}^d$ for $d \geq 1$: it is the unique allocation which is stable in the sense of the Gale-Shapley marriage problem. With this allocation, a.s. all cells are open and bounded, but not necessarily connected. Allocation rules for a PPP in $\mathbf{R}^d$ which minimize transportation cost per unit mass were considered in [HS13] with various cost functions, using tools from optimal transportation.



Figure 2: Gravitational allocation to n uniform and independent points with $n = 200$ and $n = 750$ (see Figure 1 for smaller n). The basins become more elongated as n grows, reflecting Theorem 2. The MATLAB script used to generated these figures is based on code written by Manjunath Krishnapur.

To define gravitational allocation more precisely, consider a potential $U : \mathbf{S}_n^2 \to \mathbf{R}$ given by

$$U(x) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{L}} \log |x - z|, \tag{1.2}$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes Euclidean distance in $\mathbf{R}^3$. For each location $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$, let $F(x)$ denote the negative gradient of U with respect to the usual spherical metric (i.e. the one induced from $\mathbf{R}^3$). Note that $F(x)$ is an element of the tangent space at $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$, and we think of it as describing the "force" on x arising from the potential U.

For any $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$ consider the integral curve $Y_x(t)$ defined by

$$\frac{dY_x}{dt}(t) = F(Y_x(t)), \qquad Y_x(0) = x. \tag{1.3}$$

Since F is smooth away from $\mathcal{L}$, by standard results about flows on vector fields (see e.g. the proof of Lemma 17.10 in [Lee03]), for each fixed $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$ the curve Y_x can be defined over some maximal domain $(-\infty, \tau_x)$, where $0 < \tau_x \leq \infty$. Note that the force F represents the speed of a particle, rather than being proportional to its acceleration as in Newtonian gravitation.

We define the *basin of attraction* of $z \in \mathcal{L}$ by

$$B(z) = \left\{ x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2 \, : \, \lim_{t \uparrow \tau_x} Y_x(t) = z \right\}, \tag{1.4}$$

and we take

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} z & \text{if } x \in B(z) \text{ for } z \in \mathcal{L}, \\ \infty & \text{if } x \notin \bigcup_{z \in \mathcal{L}} B(z). \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$



Figure 3: Illustration of Y_x, $B(z)$, and $\psi(x)$ for $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$ and $z \in \mathcal{L}$.

The next proposition, which we will prove in Section 2, asserts that ψ indeed defines a fair allocation of λ_n to $\mathcal{L}$.

Proposition 1. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathbf{S}_n^2$ be the sphere centered at the origin with surface area n, and let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbf{S}_n^2$ be a set of n distinct points. The function ψ given by (1.5) defines a fair allocation of λ_n to $\mathcal{L}$.*

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$. Consider any $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$, and let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbf{S}_n^2$ be a collection of n points chosen uniformly and independently at random from $\mathbf{S}_n^2$. For any $p > 0$ there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for $r > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left[|\psi(x) - x| > r\sqrt{\log n}\right] \leq Cr^{-p}. \tag{1.6}$$

In particular, for some constant $C > 0$,

$$\mathbf{E}[|\psi(x) - x|] \leq C\sqrt{\log n}. \tag{1.7}$$

We also have the following corollary.

Corollary 3. *For $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ consider two sets of n points $\mathcal{A} = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ sampled uniformly and independently at random from $\mathbf{S}_n^2$. We can define a matching φ of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ (i.e., a bijection $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$) using gravitational allocation, such that for some universal constant C,*

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} |\varphi(a_k) - a_k|\right] \leq C\sqrt{\log n}.$$



Figure 4: Illustration of the proof of Corollary 3. The set $\mathcal{B} \setminus \varphi(a_1)$ consists of $n-1$ uniform and independent points on the sphere $\mathbf{S}^2_n$ of area n.

Proof. Consider the gravitational allocation ψ to the point set $\mathcal{B}$, and set $\varphi(a_1) = \psi(a_1)$, so that Theorem 2 gives

$$\mathbf{E}[|\varphi(a_1) - a_1|] \le C\sqrt{\log n}.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{A}' := \{a_2, \dots, a_n\}, \qquad \mathcal{B}' := \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\psi(a_1)\}.$$

Note that since ψ is a fair allocation, $\psi(a_1)$ is uniformly distributed over elements of $\mathcal{B}$ (under the randomness of a_1). Thus $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{B}'$ both have the law of $n-1$ points chosen independently and uniformly at random from $\mathbf{S}^2_n$. Also, it is clear that $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{B}'$ are independent. Hence, we may repeat the same procedure with the sets $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{B}'$ to define $\varphi(a_2)$, and we bound $|\varphi(a_2) - a_2|$ using Theorem 2 with $n-1$ points. (However, note that our matching algorithm for $n-1$ points occurs on $\mathbf{S}^2_{n-1}$, so we must rescale by a multiplicative factor $\sqrt{\frac{n}{n-1}}$.) Repeating this procedure, it follows that

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} |\varphi(a_k) - a_k|\right] \le \frac{C}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\sqrt{\log(k \vee 2)} \le 2C\log n.$$

□

Remark 4. *Note that the proof of the corollary gives a general procedure for obtaining a matching algorithm from an allocation rule. If we have an allocation rule and a function $h : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ satisfying $\mathbf{E}[|\psi(z) - z|] < h(n)$, then we get a matching algorithm satisfying*

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} |\varphi(a_k) - a_k|\right] < \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}h(k). \tag{1.8}$$

Minimal matchings of random points in the plane have been extensively studied (see e.g. [AKT84, LS89, Tal94]). The asymptotic behavior of the minimal matching distance was identified in [AKT84]: it was shown that for two sets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ of n i.i.d. uniformly chosen points from $[0, \sqrt{n}]^2$, there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{P}\left(C_1\sqrt{\log n} \le \frac{1}{n}\min_{\substack{\varphi:\mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{B}\\ \text{bijective}}}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} |\varphi(a) - a| \le C_2\sqrt{\log n}\right) = 1. \tag{1.9}$$

In the limit as $n \to \infty$, one expects minimal matching on the sphere to be essentially equivalent to minimal matching in a square, as the local geometries are the same to first order. Indeed, we give a formal statement of one direction of this equivalence in the next proposition, which is proved in Section 6.

Proposition 5. *Consider any integer $n \geq 2$, and write $N = n^2$. Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are two sets of N i.i.d. uniformly random points from $\mathbf{S}^2_N$, and $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are two sets of n i.i.d. uniformly random points from $[0, \sqrt{n}]^2$. Then, for a universal constant C,*

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{E} \min_{\substack{\varphi:\mathcal{A}\to B \\ bijective}} \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} |\varphi(a) - a| \leq C + \frac{C}{N} \cdot \mathbf{E} \min_{\substack{\varphi:\mathcal{X}\to\mathcal{Y} \\ bijective}} \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} |\varphi(x) - x|.$$

Combined with [AKT84], Proposition 5 immediately implies that the bound of Corollary 3 is optimal up to multiplication by a constant. It also implies that gravitational allocation gives an optimal allocation rule in the following sense. Assume we have an allocation rule for N points on $\mathbf{S}^2_N$ and a non-decreasing function $h : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbf{R}_+$ satisfying $\mathbf{E}[|\psi(z) - z|] < h(N)$. By (1.8) this gives us a matching algorithm satisfying

$$\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N} |\varphi(a_k) - a_k|\right] < \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N} \sqrt{\frac{N}{k}} h(N) < 2g(N).$$

If $h(N) = o(\sqrt{\log N})$ and $N = n^2$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we see from Proposition 5 that the optimal matching of n points on $[0, \sqrt{n}]^2$ has an expected average travel distance of order $o(\sqrt{\log n})$, which contradicts [AKT84].

Leighton and Shor studied the maximal matching distance for uniform points in the square. The lower bound derived in [Sho85, Sho86] and the upper bound derived in [LS89] show that for two sets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ of n i.i.d. uniformly chosen points from $[0, \sqrt{n}]^2$, there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{P}\left(C_1(\log n)^{3/4} \leq \min_{\substack{\varphi:\mathcal{A}\to\mathcal{B} \\ \text{bijective}}} \max_{a\in\mathcal{A}} |\varphi(a) - a| \leq C_2(\log n)^{3/4}\right) = 1. \tag{1.10}$$

The maximal travel distance for the matching algorithm used in the proof of Corollary 3 is of order $\sqrt{n}$, as compared to $(\log n)^{3/4}$ for the optimal matching. However, note that our matching algorithm is online, meaning that the points of $\mathcal{A}$ are revealed one by one, and we have to match a given point of $\mathcal{A}$ to a point of $\mathcal{B}$ before revealing the remaining points of $\mathcal{A}$. The typical maximal travel distance will always be of order $\sqrt{n}$ for online matching algorithms.

Let us now briefly outline the proof of Theorem 2. In order to bound $|\psi(x) - x|$ we will bound separately the duration τ_x of Y_x and the magnitude of the force $|F(Y_x(t))|$ for $t \in (0, \tau_x)$. By an application of Liouville's theorem (Theorem 7) we get the exact probability distribution of τ_x, which is independent of n and has an exponential upper tail. We show in Section 5 that the contribution to $|F(y)|$ coming from particles outside a ball centered at y of radius $\Theta(1/\sqrt{\log n})$ is very unlikely to exceed $C\sqrt{\log n}$ for $C \gg 1$, uniformly for y in a ball of radius $O(\sqrt{\log n})$. Therefore, if $|F(y)| \gg C\sqrt{\log n}$ the main contribution to the force is most

likely coming from points of $\mathcal{L}$ nearby y, and we deduce from this that y most likely will be swallowed by a nearby point.

The organization of the rest of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we prove Proposition 1 establishing that gravitational allocation on the sphere is in fact a fair allocation. We will then carry out most of our proofs in the complex plane under stereographic projection rather than directly on the sphere. In Section 3, we record basic facts about converting between the coordinate systems, and we restate Theorem 2 in terms of the plane (given as Theorem 13). Section 4 contains the proof of Theorem 13 (and hence Theorem 2), with the proof of the main technical estimate deferred until Section 5. Finally, we prove Proposition 5 in Section 6, and present a short list of open problems in Section 7.

Acknowledgements

We thank Manjunath Krishnapur for useful discussions as well as sharing his code for producing simulations. We also thank Weston Ungemach for reference suggestions related to Liouville's theorem. Most of this work was carried out while N. Holden and A. Zhai were visiting Microsoft Research in Redmond; they thank Microsoft for the hospitality.

2 Proof that gravitational allocation is a fair allocation

In this section, we prove Proposition 1. The non-trivial property to verify is that for each $z \in \mathcal{L}$, we have $\lambda_n(B(z)) = 1$ almost surely. Let Δ_S denote the spherical Laplacian (i.e. the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the sphere). The key property of our potential U is that $\Delta_S U$ is constant outside of $\mathcal{L}$, as seen in the next proposition.

Proposition 6. *For a given $z \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$, let $g : \mathbf{S}_n^2 \to \mathbf{R}$ be given by $g(x) = \log|x - z|$. We have*

$$\Delta_S g(x) = 2\pi\delta_z - \frac{2\pi}{n}.$$

Consequently,

$$\Delta_S U(x) = 2\pi \sum_{z \in \mathcal{L}} \delta_z - 2\pi.$$

(We view δ_z as a distribution where $\int_{\mathbf{S}_n^2} g(x)\delta_z(x)\, d\lambda_n(x) = g(z)$ for any test function $g : \mathbf{S}_n^2 \to \mathbf{R}$.)

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume $z = (0, 0, r_n)$, where $r_n = \sqrt{\frac{n}{4\pi}}$ is the radius of the sphere. In spherical coordinates, we then have $g(\theta, \phi) = \log(2\sin(\phi/2)) + \log r_n$, where θ and ϕ denote the azimuthal and polar angles, respectively. Using the formula for Δ_S in spherical coordinates, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_S g &= \frac{1}{r_n^2}\frac{1}{\sin\phi}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\left(\sin\phi \cdot \frac{\partial g}{\partial\phi}\right) + \frac{1}{r_n^2}\frac{1}{\sin^2\phi}\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial\theta^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n^2}\frac{1}{\sin\phi}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\cos^2(\phi/2) = \frac{2\pi}{n},\end{aligned}$$

which is valid at all points other than z.

Since the integral of $\Delta_S g(x)$ with respect to area measure over $\mathbf{S}_n^2$ must be 0, we deduce that $\Delta_S g = 2\pi\delta_z - \frac{2\pi}{n}$. □

Proposition 6 already gives an informal proof of Proposition 1 via the divergence theorem. Consider any $z \in \mathcal{L}$. If we assume that the cells $B(z)$ have piecewise smooth boundaries, and then note that $F(x)$ is parallel to $\partial B(z)$ at points $x \in \partial B(z)$ for which the boundary is smooth, we get

$$2\pi - 2\pi\lambda_n(B(z)) = \int_{B(z)} \Delta_S U d\lambda_n = \int_{B(z)} \operatorname{div} F d\lambda_n = -\int_{\partial B(z)} F \cdot \mathbf{n}\, ds = 0.$$

We give the formal proof using a slightly different approach (following [CPPR10a]) involving Liouville's theorem for calculating change of volume under flows, which will also be needed in proving Theorem 2. Conveniently, this approach allows us to sidestep the technicalities involved in analyzing the boundary of $B(z)$.[1] We now state the version of Liouville's theorem we need.

Proposition 7 (Liouville's Theorem)**.** *Let M be an oriented n-dimensional Riemannian manifold, and let $d\alpha$ denote its volume form. Consider a smooth vector field X on M.*

Let Φ_t denote the flow induced by X, where $\Phi_t(x) \in M$ is defined for all (x,t) in some maximal domain $\mathcal{D} \subset M \times \mathbf{R}$. Let $\Omega \subset M$ be an open set with compact closure. Then,

$$\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0} \int_{\Phi_t(\Omega)} d\alpha = \int_\Omega \operatorname{div} X \, d\alpha.$$

Proof. Since the maximal domain $\mathcal{D}$ is open (see proof of Theorem 17.9 in [Lee03]) and the closure of Ω is compact, we know that $\Phi_t(\Omega)$ is actually defined for all t in some open interval containing 0. The result then follows from the formulas used in proving Proposition 18.18 in [Lee03], where the smoothness of the relevant n-forms allows us to interchange integration over Ω and differentiation with respect to t. □

Recall that for $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$ we wrote $(-\infty, \tau_x)$ for the maximal domain for which $Y_x(t)$ is defined.

Lemma 8. *For $z \in \mathcal{L}$ and $t \geq 0$, define*

$$E_t = \{x \in B(z) \,:\, \tau_x > t\}, \qquad V_t = \lambda_n(E_t).$$

Then, we have for each t that $V_t = e^{-2\pi t} V_0$.

Proof. We apply Proposition 7 to $\mathbf{S}_n^2 \setminus \mathcal{L}$ with the vector field $X = F = -\nabla_S U$, so that $\operatorname{div} X = \operatorname{div} F = -\Delta_S U$.

Recall that $\Phi_{-s}(x) = Y_x(-s)$ is defined for all $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$ and $s \in (0, \infty)$. Thus, for all $s \in (0,t)$, we have that Φ_s is a bijection from E_t to E_{t-s} (with inverse Φ_{-s}). Also, using standard smoothness results for ODEs, it can be verified for all $t > 0$ that E_t is open with compact closure in $\mathbf{S}_n^2 \setminus \mathcal{L}$.

By Proposition 7, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{ds} V_{t-s} = -\int_{E_{t-s}} \Delta_S U \, d\lambda_n = \int_{E_{t-s}} 2\pi \, d\lambda_n = 2\pi V_{t-s}.$$

Solving the resulting differential equation for $0 \leq s \leq t$ yields $V_t = V_0 e^{-2\pi t}$, as desired. □

[1] We also believe, however, that the technicalities are not too hard to overcome using arguments similar to those in [NSV07, Section 7].



Figure 5: Illustration of the proof of Lemma 8.

We can now give the formal proof of Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1. Consider any $z \in \mathcal{L}$, and define E_t and V_t as in Lemma 8. By Lemma 8, we have for all t that

$$V_0 - V_t = V_0(1 - e^{-2\pi t}) = 2\pi V_0 \cdot t + O(t^2). \tag{2.1}$$

We will deduce that $V_0 = 1$ by estimating $V_0 - V_t$ in another way for small t.

For any $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$, let us identify the tangent space $T_x\mathbf{S}_n^2$ with a plane in $\mathbf{R}^3$ in the natural way[2], so that $F(x)$ may be regarded as a vector in $\mathbf{R}^3$. By a direct calculaton, we have $F(x) = \frac{z-x}{|z-x|^2} + O(1)$ for x in a neighborhood of z. This implies

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left|Y_x(t) - z\right|^2 = 2\langle F(Y_x(t)), Y_x(t) - z\rangle = -2 + O\left(|Y_x(t) - z|\right).$$

Write $E_{0,\varepsilon} = E_0 \setminus E_\varepsilon$. The above estimate implies for $\varepsilon \to 0$ that

$$\sup_{x \in E_{0,\varepsilon}} |x - z|^2 \le 2\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{x \notin E_{0,\varepsilon}} |x - z|^2 \ge 2\varepsilon - o(\varepsilon).$$

Thus, $E_{0,\varepsilon}$ is bounded between spherical caps of radius $\sqrt{2\varepsilon} \pm o(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, which means it has area $2\pi\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon)$. This gives

$$V_0 - V_\varepsilon = \lambda_n(E_{0,\varepsilon}) = 2\pi \cdot \varepsilon + o(\varepsilon).$$

Comparing to (2.1), we conclude that $V_0 = 1$, as desired. □

3 Stereographic projection

Rather than work directly on the sphere, it is more convenient to work in the plane via stereographic projection. We devote this section to describing how to transform between the two coordinate systems, and we give a restatement of Theorem 2 for the plane.

Let $H = \mathbf{R}^2 \times \{0\} \subset \mathbf{R}^3$ denote the horizontal plane, and let $z_0 = (0, 0, 1)$. The usual stereographic projection map $P : \mathbf{R}^3 \to \mathbf{R}^3$ is given by

$$P(x) = z_0 + \frac{2(x - z_0)}{|x - z_0|^2}.$$

[2] i.e., by $T_x\mathbf{S}_n^2 \subset T_x\mathbf{R}^3 \cong \mathbf{R}^3$.

Let $r_n = \sqrt{\frac{n}{4\pi}}$ denote the radius of $\mathbf{S}_n^2$. We use the rescaled version of P defined by $P_n(x) := \sqrt{n}P(r_n^{-1}x)$. The next proposition collects a few basic facts about P_n; these can be verified by elementary calculations.

Proposition 9. *The map $P_n : \mathbf{R}^3 \to \mathbf{R}^3$ has the following properties.*

- *For any $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^3$, we have*

$$|P_n(x) - P_n(y)|^2 = \frac{4nr_n^2 \cdot |x-y|^2}{|x - r_n z_0|^2 \cdot |y - r_n z_0|^2}.$$

- *P_n is a conformal map from $\mathbf{S}_n^2 \setminus \{r_n z_0\}$ to H. Its conformal scaling factor is $\frac{2\sqrt{n}r_n}{|x-r_n z_0|^2}$, i.e. if g and g' are the respective metrics on $\mathbf{S}_n^2 \setminus \{r_n z_0\}$ and H, then*

$$\left(\frac{2\sqrt{n}r_n}{|x - r_n z_0|^2}\right)^2 g_x = P_n^* g_{P_n(x)}.$$

Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} = \{P_n(y) : y \in \mathcal{L}\}$ be the image of $\mathcal{L}$ under P_n. Note that the points of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ are drawn independently from a measure μ_n on $\mathbf{R}^2$ that is the pushforward under P_n of the uniform probability measure on $\mathbf{S}_n^2$. For $x \in H \cong \mathbf{R}^2$, let

$$\rho_n(x) = \sqrt{1 + \frac{|x|^2}{n}}.$$

From the conformal scaling in Proposition 9, it is straightforward to check that μ_n has density

$$\frac{d\mu_n}{dx} = \frac{1}{\pi n \rho_n(x)^4}.$$

Next, we give the planar version of our potential function. We define for any $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^2$ the planar potential functions

$$u(x,y) = u_y(x) = \log \frac{|x-y|}{\rho_n(x)\rho_n(y)}, \qquad u(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{L}} u(x, P_n(y)) = \sum_{y \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}} u(x,y). \tag{3.1}$$

By Proposition 9, we see that u satisfies for all $x, y \in \mathbf{S}_n^2 \setminus \{r_n z_0\}$

$$u(P_n(x), P_n(y)) = \log\left(\frac{4n}{r_n^2}|x-y|\right) = \log|x-y| + \log(16\pi),$$

whence $u(P_n(x)) = U(x) + n\log(16\pi)$. We remark that since we only care about the gradient of the potential, the additive constant term $n\log(16\pi)$ is not important.

We also define for $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^2$ the planar gradient

$$f(x,y) = -\nabla u_y(x) = \frac{y-x}{|x-y|^2} + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{x}{1 + \frac{|x|^2}{n}}, \qquad f(x) = \sum_{y \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}} f(x,y). \tag{3.2}$$

Note however that $f(P_n(x))$ is not simply the pushforward of $F(x)$ under P_n for $x \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$. Nevertheless, $f(P_n(x))$ and $(DP_n)_x(F(x))$ are scalar multiples of each other. To see this, we invoke the following fact about conformal maps, which is routine to verify.

Proposition 10. *Let M_1 and M_2 be two Riemannian manifolds of the same dimension, and let g_1 and g_2 be their respective metrics. Suppose we have a conformal mapping $h : M_1 \to M_2$, and let $c : M_1 \to \mathbf{R}$ denote the conformal scaling factor, i.e. $h^* g_2 = c^2 g_1$. Then, for any function $w \in C^\infty(M_1)$ and $x \in M_1$, we have*

$$(Dh)_x(\nabla w) = c^2 \cdot \nabla(w \circ h^{-1}).$$

Proof. Consider any point $x \in M_1$, and its image $y = h(x) \in M_2$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the natural pairing between vectors and 1-forms. For any $v \in T_x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_2((Dh)_x v, \nabla(w \circ h^{-1})) &= \langle (Dh)_x v, d(w \circ h^{-1}) \rangle = \langle v, dw \rangle = g_1(v, \nabla w) \\ &= c^{-2}(h^* g_2)(v, \nabla w) = c^{-2} g_2((Dh)_x v, (Dh)_x(\nabla w)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(Dh)_x v$ ranges over all elements of T_y, this implies

$$\nabla(w \circ h^{-1}) = c^{-2}(Dh)_x(\nabla w),$$

which is the desired result upon multiplying both sides by c^2. □

Corollary 11. *For any $x \in \mathbf{S}^2_n$, let $\widetilde{x} = P_n(x)$. Then, we have*

$$(DP_n)_x(F(x)) = \frac{4nr_n^2}{|x - r_n z_0|^4} f(\widetilde{x}) = \pi \rho_n(\widetilde{x})^4 f(\widetilde{x}).$$

Since f and $(DP_n)_x(F)$ are scalar multiples of each other, they have the same integral curves up to reparameterization. Let us now make explicit the change of parameterization.

Proposition 12. *Consider any $\widetilde{x} \in \mathbf{R}^2$, and let $x = P_n^{-1}(\widetilde{x})$. To lighten notation, let $y_t = Y_x(t)$. Define*

$$\sigma(t) = \pi \int_0^t \rho_n(P_n(y_s))^4 \, ds \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widetilde{Y}_{\widetilde{x}}(t) = P_n(y_{\sigma^{-1}(t)}).$$

Then, $\widetilde{Y}_{\widetilde{x}}(t)$ is an integral curve along f starting at $\widetilde{x}$.

Proof. The result follows from the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\widetilde{Y}_{\widetilde{x}}(t) &= (DP_n)_x(F(y_{\sigma^{-1}(t)})) \cdot \frac{d}{dt}\sigma^{-1}(t) = (DP_n)_x(F(y_{\sigma^{-1}(t)})) \cdot \frac{1}{\sigma'(\sigma^{-1}(t))} \\ &= (DP_n)_x(F(y_{\sigma^{-1}(t)})) \cdot \frac{1}{\pi}\rho_n(\widetilde{Y}_{\widetilde{x}}(t))^{-4} = f(\widetilde{Y}_{\widetilde{x}}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Corollary 11 in the last step. □

Finally, we define the planar allocation function $\widetilde{\psi} : \mathbf{R}^2 \to \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ by $\widetilde{\psi}(\widetilde{x}) = (P_n \circ \psi \circ P_n^{-1})(\widetilde{x})$. The cells $\widetilde{\psi}^{-1}(z)$ for $z \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ will correspond to basins of attraction under the flow induced by f. We can now reduce Theorem 2 to an analogous statement in terms of the plane.

Theorem 13 (Planar version of Theorem 2)**.** *For any $p > 0$ there is a constant $C_p > 0$ such that for $r < n^{1/3}$ we have*

$$\mathbf{P}\left[|\widetilde{\psi}(0)| > r\sqrt{\log n}\right] \leq C_p r^{-p}.$$

Proof of Theorem 2 from Theorem 13. By rotational symmetry, we may assume without loss of generality that $x = P_n^{-1}(0)$. Proposition 9 ensures that we have $|x - \psi(x)| \le C|\widetilde{\psi}(0)|$ for a universal constant C. Observe that it is sufficient to prove the theorem for $r < Cn^{1/3}$, since $|x - \psi(x)| < \sqrt{n}$. Theorem 13 gives

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|x - \psi(x)| > r\sqrt{\log n}\right) \le \mathbf{P}\left(|\widetilde{\psi}(0)| > r\sqrt{\log n}/C\right) \le C_p(r/C)^{-p},$$

which is the desired inequality upon renaming of constants. □

4 Tail bound for travel distance

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 13 following the strategy described in the introduction. For any $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^2$, write

$$f(x \mid \Omega) := \sum_{y \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap \Omega} f(x, y).$$

The following lemma, whose proof is deferred to Section 5, gives an upper bound of order $\sqrt{\log n}$ for the magnitude of f at points not too close to $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$.

Lemma 14. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $M_1, M_2, M_3 \ge 1$ with $M_1 < n^{1/3}/\sqrt{\log n}$, and with $\delta = \frac{1}{M_3\sqrt{\log n}}$, we have*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(0, M_1\sqrt{\log n})} |f(x \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(x, \delta))| > M_2\sqrt{\log n}\right) \le M_1^2 e^{-cM_2/M_3 + O(1)}.$$

The next two lemmas control the behavior of points at which the magnitude of f is large.

Lemma 15. *Suppose $x \in \mathbf{R}^2$ and $r > 0$, and consider any $w \in \partial B(x, r)$. Let $n_w = \frac{1}{r}(w - x)$ denote the outward pointing unit normal vector to $\partial B(x, r)$ at w. Then, for any $y \in B(x, r)$, we have*

$$\langle f(w, y), n_w \rangle \le -\frac{1}{2r} + \frac{|w|}{n}.$$

Proof. Let $a = y - x$ and $b = w - x$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\langle y - w, w - x \rangle &= 2\langle a - b, b \rangle = -2|b|^2 + 2\langle a, b \rangle \\ &\le -|a|^2 - |b|^2 + 2\langle a, b \rangle = -|a - b|^2 \\ &= -|y - w|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(w, y), n_w \rangle &= \frac{1}{r}\left\langle \frac{y - w}{|y - w|^2} + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{w}{1 + \frac{|w|^2}{n}}, w - x \right\rangle \\ &\le \frac{\langle y - w, x - w \rangle}{r|y - w|^2} + \frac{|w|}{n} \cdot \frac{|w - x|}{r} \le -\frac{1}{2r} + \frac{|w|}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Lemma 16. *Let $x \in B(0, n^{1/2}) \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$ be given, and define*

$$\xi = \sup_{y \in B(x,\delta)} |f(y \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(y,\delta))|.$$

For any positive integer $k < \frac{1}{16}\sqrt{n}$, if $|f(x)| > ((5k)^{k+1}+1) \cdot \max(\xi, 1/\delta)$, then either $|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap B(x,\delta)| > k$ or $\widetilde{\psi}(x) \in B(x, 2\delta)$.

Proof. Let $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m$ be the points of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap B(x,\delta)$, write $\ell_i = |y_i - x|$, and assume without loss of generality that the ℓ_i are in increasing order. There is nothing to prove if $m > k$, so assume henceforth that $m \leq k$.

Note that since $|f(x)| > ((5k)^{k+1}+1) \cdot \max(\xi, 1/\delta)$, we have by the definition of ξ that

$$|f(x \mid B(x,\delta))| > (5k)^{k+1} \cdot \max(\xi, 1/\delta).$$

It follows by the pigeonhole principle that $\ell_1 \leq \frac{1}{5} \cdot (5k)^{-k} \cdot \min(\delta, 1/\xi)$. Let j be the largest index for which $\ell_j < (5k)^j \ell_1$, and let $r = (5k)^j \ell_1$. Note that $r \leq \delta/2$.

Now, consider any $w \in \partial B(x,r)$, and let $n_w = \frac{1}{r}(w-x)$ denote the outward facing unit normal vector as in Lemma 15. We will show that $\langle f(w \mid \mathbf{R}^2), n_w \rangle < 0$. To do this, we consider separately the contributions from the regions $\mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(w,\delta)$, $B(w,\delta) \setminus B(x,r)$, and $B(x,r)$.

For the first region, by the definition of ξ (and recalling that $r \leq \delta/2$), we have

$$|f(w \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(w,\delta))| \leq \xi. \tag{4.1}$$

For the second region, note that for all $i > j$, we have

$$\ell_i - r \geq (5k)^{j+1}\ell_1 - (5k)^j \ell_1 \geq 4kr,$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} |f(w \mid B(w,\delta) \setminus B(x,r))| &\leq \sum_{i=j+1}^{m} |f(w, y_i)| \leq \sum_{i=j+1}^{m} \left(\frac{1}{\ell_i - r} + \frac{|w|}{n} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4r} + \frac{k|w|}{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Finally, for the last region we have by Lemma 15 that

$$\langle f(w \mid B(x,r)), n_w \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^{j} f(w, x_i), n_w \right\rangle \leq -\frac{j}{2r} + \frac{j \cdot |w|}{n} \leq -\frac{1}{2r} + \frac{k|w|}{n}. \tag{4.3}$$

Combining (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(w \mid \mathbf{R}^2), n_w \rangle &\leq \left(-\frac{1}{2r} + \frac{k|w|}{n} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{4r} + \frac{k|w|}{n} \right) + \xi \\ &= -\frac{1}{4 \cdot (5k)^j \ell_1} + \frac{2k|w|}{n} + \xi \\ &\leq -\frac{5}{4} \max(\xi, 1/\delta) + \frac{2k|w|}{n} + \xi \\ &\leq -\frac{1}{4\delta} + \frac{2k|w|}{n} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for all $w \in \partial B(x,r)$, it follows that no integral curves of f may escape $B(x,r)$. Consequently, we must have $\widetilde{\psi}(x) \in B(x,r) \subset B(x,2\delta)$ as desired. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 13.

Proof of Theorem 13. Note that it is enough to prove the result for sufficiently large n. We will establish the desired bound by considering the probabilities of three events.

Given $p > 0$ choose $k \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $2(k-1) - 4\epsilon k > p$. Throughout the proof all implicit constants may depend on p, k, and ϵ. Define $r' = r^{1-\epsilon}$ and $r'' = r^{1-2\epsilon}$. Let $\delta = \frac{1}{r''\sqrt{\log n}}$, and define the event

$$E_1 = \bigcap_{x \in B(0, r\sqrt{\log n})} \{|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap B(x,\delta)| \leq k\}.$$

Consider a $(\delta/2)$-net $S \subset B(0, r\sqrt{\log n})$ of size $O\left(\frac{r^2 \log n}{\delta^2}\right)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(E_1^c) &\leq \sum_{s \in S} \mathbf{P}\left(|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap B(s, 2\delta)| > k\right) = O\left(\frac{r^2 \log n}{\delta^2}\right) \cdot O(\delta^{2(k+1)}) \\ &= O(r^2 \delta^{2k} \log n) = O\left(\frac{r^2}{(r'')^{2k} (\log n)^{k-1}}\right) \leq O(r^{-p}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Next, let

$$E_2 = \left\{ \max_{x \in B(0, 2r\sqrt{\log n})} |f(x \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(x,\delta))| \leq r' \sqrt{\log n} \right\}.$$

According to Lemma 14, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(E_2^c) \leq 4r^2 e^{-cr'/r'' + O(1)} = O\left(e^{-cr^\epsilon/2}\right) = O(r^{-p}). \tag{4.5}$$

Finally, we define an event relating to the "time traveled" along integral curves of F. Recall the notation $Y_z(t)$ for the integral curve along F starting at $z \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$. Let τ denote the largest time for which $Y_z(t)$ is defined for all $t \in (0, \tau)$; we have (almost surely) that $\psi(z) = Y_z(\tau)$. For $C_0 := 2\pi((5k)^{k+1} + 1)$ define the event

$$E_3 = \left\{ \tau \leq \frac{r^\epsilon}{C_0} \right\}.$$

According to Lemma 8, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(E_3^c) \leq \exp\left(-2\pi \cdot \frac{r^\epsilon}{C_0}\right) = O(r^{-p}). \tag{4.6}$$

Suppose now that E_1, E_2, and E_3 all hold. We claim that in this case $|\widetilde{\psi}(0)| \leq r\sqrt{\log n}$. Indeed, suppose instead that $|\widetilde{\psi}(0)| > r\sqrt{\log n}$.

Let $\widetilde{Y}_0(t)$ and σ be defined as in Proposition 12, i.e. $\widetilde{Y}_0(t)$ is the integral curve along f starting at $0 \in \mathbf{R}^2$, and it is related to Y_z by

$$\widetilde{Y}_0(t) = P_n(Y_z(\sigma^{-1}(t))).$$

Since $|\widetilde{Y}_0(0)| = 0$ and $|\widetilde{Y}_0(\sigma(\tau))| = |\widetilde{\psi}(0)|$, it then follows by the intermediate value theorem that there must be some minimal time $t' \in (0, \tau)$ for which $\widetilde{Y}_0(\sigma(t')) \in \partial B(0, r\sqrt{\log n})$.

Note that from the definition of σ in Proposition 12, we have

$$\sigma(t') = \pi \int_0^{t'} \rho_n(P_n(Y_z(s)))^4 \, ds = \pi \int_0^{t'} \rho_n(\widetilde{Y}_0(\sigma(s)))^4 \, ds.$$

Since $|\widetilde{Y}_0(\sigma(s))| < r\sqrt{\log n} < n^{1/3}\sqrt{\log n}$ for all $s < t'$, the integrand is bounded above by 2 for sufficiently large n. Consequently, we have

$$\sigma(t') \leq 2\pi t'.$$

Then, by a version of the mean value theorem, we must have for some $s \in (0, t')$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\widetilde{Y}_0(\sigma(s)))| &\geq \frac{1}{\sigma(t')} |\widetilde{Y}_0(\sigma(t')) - \widetilde{Y}_0(0)| \\ &\geq \frac{r\sqrt{\log n}}{2\pi t'} \geq \frac{r\sqrt{\log n}}{2\pi\tau} \geq \frac{C_0}{2\pi} r'\sqrt{\log n}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where in the last step we have used the assumption that E_3 holds.

Our next goal is to apply Lemma 16 with $x = \widetilde{Y}_0(\sigma(s))$. First, we must establish that the hypothesis holds. Note that since E_2 holds, we have

$$\xi := \sup_{y \in B(x,\delta)} |f(y \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(y, \delta))| \leq r'\sqrt{\log n}.$$

Then, (4.7) gives

$$|f(x)| \geq \frac{C_0}{2\pi} r'\sqrt{\log n} \geq \frac{C_0}{2\pi} \max(\xi, 1/\delta),$$

verifying the hypothesis for Lemma 16.

Then, we must either have $|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap B(x, 2\delta)| \leq k$ or $\widetilde{\psi}(x) \in B(x, 2\delta)$. However, the first statement contradicts the assumption that E_1 holds, while the second statement contradicts $\widetilde{\psi}(x) = \widetilde{\psi}(0) \notin B(0, r\sqrt{\log n})$. Thus, we conclude that whenever E_1, E_2, and E_3 all hold, then $|\widetilde{\psi}(0)| \leq r\sqrt{\log n}$. In other words, we have using (4.4), (4.5), and (4.6) that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|\widetilde{\psi}(0)| > r\sqrt{\log n}\right) \leq \mathbf{P}(E_1^c) + \mathbf{P}(E_2^c) + \mathbf{P}(E_3^c) \leq O(r^{-p}),$$

as desired. □

5 Tail bound for gravitational force

The goal of this section is to prove Lemma 14. In fact, we will prove the closely related bound given by Lemma 17 below, from which Lemma 14 follows easily.

Lemma 17. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for any $M \geq 1$ and $z \in B(0, n^{1/3})$, and with $\delta = \frac{1}{M\sqrt{\log n}}$, we have*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(z, \sqrt{\log n})} |f(x \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(x, \delta))| > tM\sqrt{\log n}\right) \leq e^{-ct + O(1)}.$$

Proof of Lemma 14 from Lemma 17. Let $S \subset B(0, M_1\sqrt{\log n})$ be a $\sqrt{\log n}$-net with $|S| = O(M_1^2)$. For each $z \in S$, we apply Lemma 17 to the disk of radius $\sqrt{\log n}$ centered at z with $M = M_3$ and $t = M_2/M_3$. Taking a union bound, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(0, M_1\sqrt{\log n})} |f(x \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(x, \delta))| > M_2\sqrt{\log n}\right) \leq M_1^2 \cdot e^{-cM_2/M_3 + O(1)},$$

as desired. □

Throughout the section, we will often consider separately the effects of points in $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ within various regions. To this end, it is convenient to extend the notation $f(x \mid \Omega)$ introduced earlier to more general functions: for any function $H : \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^2 \to \mathbf{R}^k$, we write

$$H(x \mid \Omega) := \sum_{y \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap \Omega} H(x, y)$$

$$\overline{H}(x \mid \Omega) := \mathbf{E}[H(x \mid \Omega)] = n \int_\Omega H(x, y)\, d\mu_n(y).$$

The proof of Lemma 17, given in Section 5.5, uses a series of lemmas which will occupy the remainder of this section.

5.1 Basic estimates

We first collect some basic estimates that will be used repeatedly. Let $D_1 f(x, y)$ denote the Hessian of $u_y(x)$, and let $D_2 f(x, y)$ denote the tensor of third partials of $u_y(x)$ (we may regard $D_1 f$ and $D_2 f$ as elements of $\mathbf{R}^4$ and $\mathbf{R}^8$, respectively). The following lemma follows from direct calculation using the formula (3.2) for f.

Lemma 18. *For $x \in B(0, \sqrt{n})$ and any y, we have the bounds*

$$|f(x, y)| \leq O\left(\frac{1}{|x - y|}\right) + O\left(\frac{|x|}{n}\right) \tag{5.1}$$

$$|D_1 f(x, y)| \leq O\left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \tag{5.2}$$

$$|D_2 f(x, y)| \leq O\left(\frac{1}{|x - y|^3}\right) + O\left(\frac{|x|}{n^2}\right) \tag{5.3}$$

We also give here a general exponential tail bound which will be used repeatedly.

Lemma 19. *Suppose $g : \Omega \to [-1, 1]^k$ for some $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^2$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ be a set of n points drawn independently from μ_n, and let $Y = \sum_{z \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap \Omega} g(z)$. Then,*

$$\log \mathbf{P}\left(|Y| \geq t\right) \leq -\frac{1}{k} \cdot t + \log(2k) + 2n \int_\Omega |g(z)|\, d\mu_n(z), \tag{5.4}$$

$$\log \mathbf{P}\left(|Y - \mathbf{E}Y| \geq t\right) \leq -\frac{1}{k} \cdot t + \log(2k) + 2n \int_\Omega |g(z)|^2\, d\mu_n(z). \tag{5.5}$$

Remark 20. *We will only use Lemma 19 for $k \leq 4$.*

Proof. Write $g(x) = (g_1(x), g_2(x), \ldots, g_k(x))$, and let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be the points of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$. For $1 \le i \le k$ and $1 \le j \le n$, let $Z_{ij} = \mathbf{1}_{x_j \in \Omega} g_i(x_j)$. We use the inequalities

$$e^s \le 1 + 2s, \qquad e^s \le 1 + s + 2s^2$$

for $s \in [-1, 1]$. Since $|g_i(x_j)| \le 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}[e^{Z_{ij}}] &= 1 + \int_\Omega (e^{g_i(z)} - 1)\, d\mu_n(z) \le 1 + 2\int_\Omega |g_i(z)|\, d\mu_n(z) \\
&\le \exp\left(2\int_\Omega |g_i(z)|\, d\mu_n(z)\right) \\
\mathbf{E}[e^{Z_{ij} - \mathbf{E}Z_{ij}}] &= 1 + \int_\Omega (e^{g_i(z)} - g_i(z) - 1)\, d\mu_n(z) \le 1 + 2\int_\Omega |g_i(z)|^2\, d\mu_n(z) \\
&\le \exp\left(2\int_\Omega |g_i(z)|^2\, d\mu_n(z)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting Y_i denote the i-th coordinate of Y, summing the above bounds over all j and using Markov's inequality yields

$$\log \mathbf{P}\left(Y_i \ge t\right) \le -t + 2n\int_\Omega |g(z)|\, d\mu_n(z)$$

$$\log \mathbf{P}\left(Y_i - \mathbf{E}Y_i \ge t\right) \le -t + 2n\int_\Omega |g(z)|^2\, d\mu_n(z).$$

The above inequalities also apply for Y_i replaced with $-Y_i$. Union bounding over $1 \le i \le k$ and both choices of signs, and using the inequalities $|Y| \le \sum_{i=1}^k |Y_i|$ and $|Y - \mathbf{E}Y| \le \sum_{i=1}^k |Y_i - \mathbf{E}Y_i|$, we obtain (5.4) and (5.5), as desired. □

5.2 Bounds of averages

Lemma 21. *Consider a point $z \in B(0, n^{1/2})$ and a radius $R \le n^{1/2}$. Let $\Omega = \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(z, R)$. Then,*

$$|\overline{f}(z \mid \Omega)| = O(R).$$

Proof. First, note that by rotational symmetry, we have $\mathbf{E}[F(z)] = 0$ for any $z \in \mathbf{S}_n^2$. Thus, by Corollary 11, we have

$$\overline{f}(z \mid \mathbf{R}^2) = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Next, by Lemma 18, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\overline{f}(z \mid B(z, R))| &= \left| n\int_{B(z,R)} f(z, y)\mu_n(y)\, dy \right| \le \int_{B(z,R)} |f(z, y)|\, dy \\
&= O\left(\int_0^R 2\pi r \cdot \frac{1}{r}\, dr\right) + O\left(R^2|z|/n\right) = O(R).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (5.6), we obtain

$$|\overline{f}(z \mid \Omega)| \le |\overline{f}(z \mid \mathbf{R}^2)| + |\overline{f}(z \mid B(z, R))| = O(R).$$

□

Lemma 22. *Consider a point $z \in B(0, n^{1/2})$ and a radius $R \le n^{1/2}$. Let $\Omega = \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(z, R)$. Then,*

$$|\overline{D_1 f}(z \mid \Omega)| = O(1).$$

Proof. By direct calculation, we find that

$$D_1 f(z, y) = \frac{2(z-y)^{\otimes 2} - |z-y|^2 I_2}{|z-y|^4} + \frac{1}{n}\left(\frac{I_2}{1+\frac{|z|^2}{n}} - \frac{2z^{\otimes 2}}{n\left(1+\frac{|z|^2}{n}\right)^2}\right).$$

Let $A(z, y)$ and $B(z, y)$ denote the first and second terms, respectively. Note that for any $r > 0$, we have by rotational symmetry that

$$\int_0^{2\pi} A(z, z + re^{i\theta})\, d\theta = 0.$$

Also, since $|z| \le n^{1/2}$, we have $|B(z, y)| = O(n^{-1})$ for all y. We then have with h_n denoting the density of the measure μ_n

$$\begin{aligned}
|\overline{D_1 f}(z \mid \Omega)| &= n\left|\int_\Omega (A(z, y) + B(z, y))\mu_n(y)\, dy\right| \\
&= n\left|\int_R^\infty r \int_0^{2\pi} A(z, z + re^{i\theta})\mu_n(z + re^{i\theta})\, d\theta\, dr\right| + O(1) \\
&\le n\int_R^\infty r \cdot \max_{y \in \partial B(z,r)} |A(z, y)| \cdot \max_{y, y' \in \partial B(z,r)} |h_n(y) - h_n(y')|\, dr + O(1). \qquad (5.7)
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the final expression, first note that $|A(x, y)| = O\left(\frac{1}{|x-y|^2}\right)$. Also, for any $r > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{y, y' \in \partial B(z,r)} |h_n(y) - h_n(y')| &= \frac{1}{\pi n\left(1+\frac{(r-|z|)^2}{n}\right)^4} - \frac{1}{\pi n\left(1+\frac{(r+|z|)^2}{n}\right)^4} \\
&\le \left|\frac{(r-|z|)^2}{n} - \frac{(r+|z|)^2}{n}\right| \cdot \frac{4}{\pi n\left(1+\frac{(r-|z|)^2}{n}\right)^5} = O\left(\frac{r|z|}{n^2 \max(1, r^{10}/n^5)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying these estimates to (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\overline{D_1 f}(z \mid \Omega)| &\le O\left(\int_R^\infty \frac{|z|}{n \max(1, r^{10}/n^5)}\, dr\right) + O(1) \\
&= O\left(\frac{|z|}{n^{1/2}}\right) + O(1) = O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

5.3 Far contributions

Lemma 23. *Let R be a number with $1 \le R \le n^{1/3}$. Consider any point $z \in B(0, n^{1/3})$, and let $\Omega = \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(z, 2R)$. Then, for some $c > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(z,R)} |f(x \mid \Omega)| > t(R + \sqrt{\log n})\right) \le e^{-ct + O(1)}$$

Proof. We first claim that for small enough c, each of the following inequalities occurs with probability at least $1 - e^{-ct+O(1)}$:

$$|f(z \mid \Omega)| \le t(R + \sqrt{\log n}) \tag{5.8}$$

$$|D_1 f(z \mid \Omega)| \le t \tag{5.9}$$

$$\max_{x \in B(z,R)} |D_2 f(x \mid \Omega)| \le t/R \tag{5.10}$$

We do this by applying Lemma 19 three times with different functions f.

First, take $g(x) = \frac{1}{C_1\sqrt{\log n}} f(z, x)$ with C_1 a large enough constant so that Lemma 18 gives the upper bound

$$|g(x)| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}} \left(\frac{1}{|z-x|} + \frac{|z|}{n}\right) \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}} \left(\frac{1}{|z-x|} + n^{-2/3}\right).$$

Note that this bound ensures $|g(x)| \le 1$ for all $x \in \Omega$, so that Lemma 19 applies. Lemma 19 then gives

$$\begin{aligned}\log \mathbf{P}\left(|f(z \mid \Omega) - \overline{f}(z \mid \Omega)| > C_1 t\sqrt{\log n}\right) &\le -\frac{1}{2}t + O(1) + 2n \int_\Omega \frac{\left(\frac{1}{|z-x|} + n^{-2/3}\right)^2}{\log n}\, d\mu_n(x) \\ &\le -\frac{1}{2}t + O(1) + 4n \int_\Omega \frac{\frac{1}{|z-x|^2} + n^{-4/3}}{\log n}\, d\mu_n(x). \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

We estimate the integral in the last expression by observing that $\mu_n(x) = O(1/n)$ for all x, and $\mu_n(x) = O\left(\frac{n}{|x-z|^4}\right)$ for $x \notin B(z, n^{1/2})$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} n \int_\Omega \frac{\frac{1}{|z-x|^2} + n^{-4/3}}{\log n}\, d\mu_n(x) &\le \frac{O(1)}{\log n} \left(\int_{2R}^{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{r}{n^{4/3}}\right) dr + \int_{\sqrt{n}}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{r} + \frac{r}{n^{4/3}}\right) \frac{n^2}{r^4}\, dr\right) \\ &= \frac{O(1)}{\log n} \left(O(\log n) + O(1)\right) = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting into (5.11), we obtain

$$\log \mathbf{P}\left(|f(z \mid \Omega) - \overline{f}(z \mid \Omega)| > C_1 t\sqrt{\log n}\right) \le -\frac{1}{2}t + O(1).$$

By Lemma 21, we also have $\overline{f}(z \mid \Omega) = O(R)$. Thus, after rescaling t, we see that (5.8) occurs with probability at least $1 - e^{-ct+O(1)}$ for small enough c.

Next, take $g(x) = \frac{1}{C_2} D_1 f(z, x)$ with C_2 large enough so that Lemma 18 gives

$$|g(x)| \le \frac{1}{|x-z|^2} + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Using Lemma 19, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathbf{P}\left(|D_1 f(z \mid \Omega) - \overline{D_1 f}(z \mid \Omega)| > C_2 t\right) &\le -\frac{1}{4}t + O(1) + 2n \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{|x-z|^2} + \frac{1}{n}\right)^2 d\mu_n(x) \\
&\le -\frac{1}{4}t + O(1) + 4n \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{|x-z|^4} + \frac{1}{n^2}\right) d\mu_n(x) \\
&= -\frac{1}{4}t + O(1) + \frac{4}{n}\mu_n(\Omega) + O\left(\int_R^\infty \frac{1}{r^4} \cdot r\, dr\right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{4}t + O(1) + O(1/n) + O(1/R^2) = -\frac{1}{4}t + O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 22, $|\overline{D_1 f}(z \mid \Omega)| = O(1)$. Thus, after rescaling t, we see that (5.9) also occurs with probability at least $1 - e^{-ct+O(1)}$ for small enough c.

Finally, we take $g(y) = \frac{R}{C_3} \cdot \max_{x \in B(z,R)} |D_2 f(x, y)|$ with C_3 large enough so that Lemma 18 gives

$$|g(y)| \le \frac{R}{|y-z|^3} + Rn^{-4/3}.$$

Using Lemma 19, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(z,R)} |D_2 f(x \mid \Omega)| > C_3 t/R\right) &\le \log \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{R}{C_3} \sum_{y \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap \Omega} \max_{x \in B(z,R)} |D_2 f(x, y)| > t\right) \\
&\le -t + O(1) + 2n \int_\Omega \left(\frac{R}{|y-z|^3} + Rn^{-4/3}\right) d\mu_n(y) \\
&\le -t + O(1) + 2n^{-1/3} R \mu_n(\Omega) + O\left(\int_R^\infty \frac{R}{r^3} \cdot r\, dr\right) = -t + O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, after rescaling t, (5.10) occurs with probability at least $1 - e^{-ct+O(1)}$ for small enough c.

Now, suppose that the inequalities (5.8), (5.9), and (5.10) all hold. Then, (5.9) and (5.10) imply that

$$\max_{x \in B(z,R)} |D_1 f(x \mid \Omega)| \le 2t.$$

Combining this with (5.8) yields

$$\max_{x \in B(z,R)} |f(x \mid \Omega)| \le t(3R + \sqrt{\log n}),$$

which holds with probability at least $1 - e^{-ct+O(1)}$. Rescaling t gives the result. □

5.4 Near contributions

Lemma 24. *Let $0 < q < \frac{1}{2}$ and $2 < R < n^{1/3}$ be given. Consider any $z \in B(0, n^{1/3})$ and any $\Omega \subset B(0,R) \setminus B(z,q)$. There is an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(z,q/2)} |f(x \mid \Omega) - \overline{f}(z \mid \Omega)| \geq t/q\right) \leq q^{ct - O(1)} e^{O(q \log R)}.$$

Proof. Let $\Omega_1 = \Omega \setminus B(z,1)$ and $\Omega_2 = \Omega \cap B(z,1)$.

We first apply Lemma 19 twice on Ω_1. Taking $f(y) = \frac{q}{C_1} \max_{x \in B(z,q/2)} |D_1 f(x,y)|$ with C_1 large enough to ensure that $|g(y)| \leq 1$ on Ω_1, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(z,q/2)} |D_1 f(x \mid \Omega_1)| \geq C_1 t/q\right) &\leq -t + O(1) + 2n \int_{\Omega_1} |g(y)| \, d\mu_n(y) \\
&\leq -t + O(1) + O(nq) \cdot \int_{\Omega_1} \left(\frac{1}{|y-z|^2} + \frac{1}{n}\right) d\mu_n(y) \qquad (5.12) \\
&\leq -t + O(1) + O(q\mu_n(\Omega_1)) + O\left(\int_1^{2R} \frac{q}{r^2} \cdot r \, dr\right) \\
&= -t + O(1) + O(q \log R). \qquad (5.13)
\end{aligned}$$

For our second application of Lemma 19, we take $g(y) = \frac{\sqrt{q}}{C_2} f(z,y)$ with C_2 large enough to ensure $|g(y)| \leq 1$ on Ω_1. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \mathbf{P}\left(|f(z \mid \Omega_1) - \overline{f}(z \mid \Omega_1)| \geq C_2 t/\sqrt{q}\right) &\leq -\frac{1}{2}t + O(1) + 2n \int_{\Omega_1} |g(y)|^2 \, d\mu_n(y) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2}t + O(1) + O(nq) \cdot \int_{\Omega_1} \left(\frac{1}{|y-z|} + \frac{|z|}{n}\right)^2 d\mu_n(y) \\
&\leq -\frac{1}{2}t + O(1) + O\left(nq \cdot \frac{|z|^2}{n^2}\right) \cdot \mu_n(\Omega_1) + O\left(\int_1^{2R} \frac{q}{r^2} \cdot r \, dr\right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}t + O(1) + O(q \log R). \qquad (5.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5.13) and (5.14) and rescaling t, we obtain

$$\log \mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(z,q/2)} |f(x \mid \Omega_1) - \overline{f}(z \mid \Omega_1)| \geq t/\sqrt{q}\right) \leq -ct + O(1) + O(q \log R)$$

for sufficiently small c. Setting $t = s/\sqrt{q}$, this may be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x \in B(z,q/2)} |f(x \mid \Omega_1) - \overline{f}(z \mid \Omega_1)| \geq s/q\right) &\leq e^{-cs/\sqrt{q} + O(1) + O(q \log R)} \\
&\leq q^{cs - O(1)} \cdot e^{O(q \log R)}. \qquad (5.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we analyze the contribution from Ω_2. Let $g(y) = \frac{1}{C_3} \cdot q \log \frac{1}{q} \cdot \max_{x \in B(z,q/2)} |f(x,y)|$, where C_3 is a large enough constant so that (using Lemma 18)

$$g(y) \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot q \log \frac{1}{q} \cdot \frac{1}{|y-z|}$$

for all $y \in \Omega_2$. We cannot apply Lemma 19 directly, because we do not have $|f(y)| \le 1$ on all of Ω_2. However, a similar argument using a more precise analysis of exponential moments will work. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\left[e^{\sum_{y\in\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}\cap\Omega_2} g(y)}\right] &= \left(1 + \int_{\Omega_2} (e^{g(x)} - 1)\, d\mu_n(x)\right)^n \le \exp\left(n \int_{\Omega_2} (e^{g(x)} - 1)\, d\mu_n(x)\right) \\
&\le \exp\left(2\int_q^1 \left(\exp\left(\frac{1}{4}\cdot q \log\frac{1}{q}\cdot\frac{1}{r}\right) - 1\right)\cdot r\, dr\right) \\
&\le \exp\left(2\int_q^{q^{1/2}} q^{-1/4}\, dr + O\left(\int_{q^{1/2}}^1 q\log\frac{1}{q}\, dr\right)\right) \\
&= \exp\left(O(q^{1/4})\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Markov's inequality then implies

$$\log \mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x\in B(z,q/2)} |f(x \mid \Omega_2)| \ge \frac{C_3 t}{q\log\frac{1}{q}}\right) \le -t + O(q^{1/4}).$$

Setting $t = \frac{1}{C_3}\log\frac{1}{q}\cdot s$, this may be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x\in B(z,q/2)} |f(x \mid \Omega_2)| \ge s/q\right) \le q^{s/C_3 - O(1)}.$$

Note that this also implies that $|\overline{f}(z \mid \Omega_2)| = O(1/q)$, and so we may conclude that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x\in B(z,q/2)} |f(x \mid \Omega_2) - \overline{f}(z \mid \Omega_2)| \ge s/q\right) \le q^{cs - O(1)} \tag{5.16}$$

for small enough c. Combining (5.15) and (5.16) gives the result. □

5.5 Overall disk bound: Proof of Lemma 17

Proof. Let $\Omega = B(z, 2\sqrt{\log n})$. According to Lemma 23 with $R = \sqrt{\log n}$, we have for small enough c that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{x\in B(z,\sqrt{\log n})} |f(x \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus \Omega)| > \frac{1}{2} tM\sqrt{\log n}\right) \le e^{-ctM + O(1)}. \tag{5.17}$$

We next consider contributions from within Ω. Let $S \subset B(z, \sqrt{\log n})$ be a δ-net of $B(z, \sqrt{\log n})$ with $|S| = O(\log n/\delta^2)$. For each $s \in S$, we apply Lemma 24 with the region $\Omega_s := \Omega \setminus B(s, 2\delta)$. We use the parameters $q = 2\delta$ and $R = 4\sqrt{\log n}$. For a small enough c, this gives

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{y\in B(s,\delta)} |f\,(y \mid \Omega_s) - \overline{f}(s \mid \Omega_s)| \ge t/4\delta\right) \le \delta^{ct - O(1)} e^{O(\delta \log\log n)} = \delta^{ct - O(1)}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{y\in B(s,\delta)} |f\,(y \mid \Omega \setminus B(y,\delta)) - \overline{f}(s \mid \Omega_s)| \ge t/2\delta\right) \\
&\qquad \le \delta^{ct - O(1)} + \mathbf{P}\left(|\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} \cap (B(s, 2\delta) \setminus B(y,\delta))| \ge t/4\right) \le \delta^{ct - O(1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using a union bound over all $s \in S$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{\substack{s\in S\\ y\in B(s,\delta)}} |f\left(y \mid \Omega \setminus B(y,\delta)\right) - \overline{f}(s \mid \Omega_s)| \geq \frac{1}{2}tM\sqrt{\log n}\right) \leq |S| \cdot \delta^{ct-O(1)}$$

$$\leq (\log n) \cdot \delta^{-2} \cdot \delta^{ct-O(1)} = \delta^{ct-O(1)} \leq e^{-ct+O(1)}.$$

Note that by Lemma 21 and (5.17), we have

$$|\overline{f}(s \mid \Omega_s)| \leq |\overline{f}(s \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus B(s,2\delta))| + |\overline{f}(s \mid \mathbf{R}^2 \setminus \Omega)| \leq O(1) + O(\sqrt{\log n}),$$

so it follows that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\max_{\substack{s\in S\\ y\in B(s,\delta)}} |f\left(y \mid \Omega \setminus B(y,\delta)\right)| \geq \frac{1}{2}tM\sqrt{\log n}\right) \leq e^{-ct+O(1)}.$$

Combining with (5.17) completes the proof. □

6 Relating matchings in squares and on spheres

In this section we will give the proof of Proposition 5.

Proof of Proposition 5. Let $Q = [0, \sqrt{n\pi}]^2 \subset \mathbf{R}^2$, and let $\widehat{Q} = P_N^{-1}(Q) \subset \mathbf{S}_N^2$. It is more convenient to consider $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ having points drawn i.i.d. uniformly from Q rather than $[0, \sqrt{n}]^2$; clearly, the original statement follows after rescaling by $\sqrt{\pi}$.

We will construct matchings of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ based on matchings of $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{Y}$. We first note that $|\mathcal{X} \cap \widehat{Q}| \sim \mathrm{Binom}(N, \lambda_N(\widehat{Q})/N)$, and since

$$\lambda_N(\widehat{Q}) = N\mu_N(Q) = n + O(n/N),$$

we then have

$$\mathbf{E}\left||\mathcal{X} \cap \widehat{Q}| - n\right| = O(\sqrt{n}).$$

Moreover, conditioned on the size of $|\mathcal{X} \cap \widehat{Q}|$, the points of $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} := P_n(\mathcal{X} \cap \widehat{Q})$ are distributed i.i.d. on Q according to a density proportional to μ_N, which is within $O(n/N)$ in total variation distance to uniform. It then follows by simple calculations that $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}$ may be coupled to $\mathcal{A}$ so that

$$\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{A} \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{A}}| = O(\sqrt{n}) + O\left(n \cdot \frac{n}{N}\right) = O(\sqrt{n}).$$

Similarly, we may couple $\widehat{\mathcal{B}} := P_N(\mathcal{Y} \cap \widehat{Q})$ to $\mathcal{B}$ so that $\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{B} \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}| = O(\sqrt{n})$.

Now, let $\widehat{\varphi} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ be a matching which minimizes $\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} |x - \widehat{\varphi}(x)|$, let $d_{\min}$ denote the minimal value. Define the sets

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{A}}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \left\{a \in \mathcal{A}_1 : (P_N \circ \widehat{\varphi} \circ P_N^{-1})(a) \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}\right\}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_3 = \left\{a \in \mathcal{A}_2 : (P_N \circ \widehat{\varphi} \circ P_N^{-1})(a) \in \mathcal{B}\right\},$$

which satisfy $\mathcal{A}_3 \subset \mathcal{A}_2 \subset \mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}$. We may define a matching $\varphi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ by setting $\varphi(a) = (P_N \circ \widehat{\varphi} \circ P_N^{-1})(a)$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}_3$ and matching the remaining points in an arbitrary manner.

Note that the distance between any two points in Q is at most $\sqrt{2\pi n}$. Also, by rotational symmetry, we have

$$\mathbf{E} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_3} |a - \varphi(a)| \le 2\mathbf{E} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X} \cap \widehat{Q}} |x - \widehat{\varphi}(x)| = \frac{2\lambda_N(\widehat{Q})}{N} \mathbf{E}[d_{\min}] = O\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \cdot \mathbf{E}[d_{\min}].$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |a - \varphi(a)| &\le \mathbf{E} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}_3} |a - \varphi(a)| + \sqrt{2\pi n} \cdot \mathbf{E}|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_3| \\
&= O\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \cdot \mathbf{E}[d_{\min}] + \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\mathbf{E}|\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_1| + \mathbf{E}|\mathcal{A}_1 \setminus \mathcal{A}_2| + \mathbf{E}|\mathcal{A}_2 \setminus \mathcal{A}_3|\right) \\
&\le O\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \cdot \mathbf{E}[d_{\min}] + \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(O(\sqrt{n}) + \mathbf{E}|\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}_2| + \mathbf{E}|\mathcal{B} \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}|\right) \\
&= O\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \cdot \mathbf{E}[d_{\min}] + O(n) + O(\sqrt{n}) \cdot \mathbf{E}|\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}_2|. \qquad (6.1)
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate $\mathbf{E}|\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}_2|$. We will use the fact that for piecewise smooth curves $\gamma, \gamma' \subset \mathbf{S}^2_N$ and a rotation $\vartheta \in SO_3(\mathbf{R})$ chosen uniformly at random, the expected number of intersections of γ with $\vartheta\gamma'$ is proportional to $\frac{1}{N} \cdot |\gamma| \cdot |\gamma'|$. (See e.g. the spherical kinematic formula given in [SW08], Theorem 6.5.6. Our statement amounts to the special case $j = 0$ and $A = B = \mathbf{S}^2$.)

For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let γ_x denote the geodesic in $\mathbf{S}^2_N$ connecting x to $\widehat{\varphi}(x)$. Then, the rotational symmetry of $\mathcal{X}$ and the above kinematic formula give

$$\mathbf{E}|\widehat{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}_2| \le \mathbf{E}\left|\{x \in \mathcal{X} : \gamma_x \cap \partial\widehat{Q} \neq \emptyset\}\right| \le O(1) \cdot \frac{|\partial\widehat{Q}|}{N} \cdot \mathbf{E} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\gamma_x|. \qquad (6.2)$$

Substituting (6.2) into (6.1) and using the facts that $|\partial\widehat{Q}| = O(\sqrt{n})$ and $\mathbf{E}\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\gamma_x| = O(\mathbf{E}[d_{\min}])$, we conclude that

$$\mathbf{E} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |a - \varphi(a)| \le O(n) + O\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \mathbf{E}[d_{\min}],$$

which gives the desired result upon dividing by n. □

7 Open problems

1. The matching algorithm we consider in Corollary 3 considers the gravitational field defined by the points $\mathcal{B}$. One could attempt to define and analyze a matching algorithm where $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ both exert forces on the particles of the opposite kind, and maybe also repulse particles of the same kind. One difficulty is that after the dynamics have evolved for some time the points exerting gravitational force are no longer uniformly distributed.

2. In Corollary 3 we consider a matching algorithm defined in terms of gravitational allocation. An alternative greedy matching algorithm can be obtained by iteratively matching nearest pairs of points, i.e., we find $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $|a_i - b_j|$ is minimized, we define $\varphi(a_i) = b_j$, and we repeat the procedure with $\mathcal{A} \setminus \{a_i\}$ and $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{b_j\}$. [HPPS09, Theorem 6] suggests that an upper bound for the average matching distance is $\int_0^{\sqrt{n}} r^{-0.496\dots}\, dr = \Theta(n^{0.252\dots})$. Can this bound be improved?

References

[AKT84] M. Ajtai, J. Komlós, and G. Tusnády. On optimal matchings. *Combinatorica*, 4(4):259–264, 1984.

[CPPR10a] S. Chatterjee, R. Peled, Y. Peres, and D. Romik. Gravitational allocation to Poisson points. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 172(1):617–671, 2010.

[CPPR10b] S. Chatterjee, R. Peled, Y. Peres, and D. Romik. Phase transitions in gravitational allocation. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 20(4):870–917, 2010.

[HHP06] C. Hoffman, A. E. Holroyd, and Y. Peres. A stable marriage of Poisson and Lebesgue. *Ann. Probab.*, 34(4):1241–1272, 2006.

[HHP09] C. Hoffman, A. E. Holroyd, and Y. Peres. Tail bounds for the stable marriage of Poisson and Lebesgue. *Canad. J. Math.*, 61(6):1279–1299, 2009.

[HL01] A. E. Holroyd and T. M. Liggett. How to find an extra head: optimal random shifts of Bernoulli and Poisson random fields. *Ann. Probab.*, 29(4):1405–1425, 2001.

[HPPS09] A. E. Holroyd, R. Pemantle, Y. Peres, and O. Schramm. Poisson matching. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 45(1):266–287, 2009.

[HS13] M. Huesmann and K.-T. Sturm. Optimal transport from Lebesgue to Poisson. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(4):2426–2478, 2013.

[Lee03] J. M. Lee. *Introduction to smooth manifolds*, volume 218 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.

[Lig02] T. M. Liggett. Tagged particle distributions or how to choose a head at random. In *In and out of equilibrium (Mambucaba, 2000)*, volume 51 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 133–162. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2002.

[LS89] T. Leighton and P. Shor. Tight bounds for minimax grid matching with applications to the average case analysis of algorithms. *Combinatorica*, 9(2):161–187, 1989.

[NSV07] F. Nazarov, M. Sodin, and A. Volberg. Transportation to random zeroes by the gradient flow. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 17(3):887–935, 2007.

[Sho85] P. W. Shor. *Random planar matching and bin packing*. PhD thesis, MIT Math. Dept., 1985.

[Sho86] P. W. Shor. The average-case analysis of some on-line algorithms for bin packing. *Combinatorica*, 6(2):179–200, 1986. Theory of computing (Singer Island, Fla., 1984).

[SW08] R. Schneider and W. Weil. *Stochastic and integral geometry*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.

[Tal94] M. Talagrand. Matching theorems and empirical discrepancy computations using majorizing measures. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 7(2):455–537, 1994.